



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

GERMAN DIALECTS.

Bibliographie der deutschen Mundartenforschung, zusammengestellt von FERDINAND MENTZ. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1892. 8vo, pp. xx, 181.

THIS is the second volume of the 'Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken deutscher Mundarten, herausgegeben von Otto Bremer,' and is sure to be welcomed by those who wish to see what has been done, as well as what remains to be done, in the study and investigation of German dialects. The whole number of articles, treatises, and dissertations, a list of which Dr. Mentz has here compiled, amounts to more than seventeen hundred, dating all the way back to the beginning of the eighteenth century and reaching down to the end of 1889. It would be difficult for any one not familiar with the comparative study of German dialects to tell how near this compilation comes to being complete, but there is good reason to believe that no serious omissions have to be recorded. Another, and more interesting, question is, how much will have to be added in a later edition, or in a supplement, which shall give us the titles of the books and pamphlets published after 1889. Judging from the interest taken since then in the dialects of the Lower Harz and the duchy of Braunschweig, these additions will not be few, for between Dr. Mentz' numbers 1515 and 1525 alone, which cover the publications pertaining to the dialects of those districts, there will have to be inserted no less than three dissertations, namely: on the dialects of Stiege (Göttingen, 1890), on that of Meinersen (Jena 1890), and on that of Börssum (Jena, 1891), perhaps also a certain 'Ostfälisches Idiotikon,' which was begun in 1889. But even if other districts shall prove to have received much less attention in proportion, it is still not unreasonable to expect that before long the strictly scientific study of the various popular idioms will throw some new light on the question of the boundary lines and the best classification of German dialects. It will then also be time, and not until then, to judge of the merits of Dr. Bremer's map of dialects, as compared with Wenker's 'Sprachatlas,' Jellinghaus' 'Einteilung der niederdeutschen

Mundarten,' and similar attempts at classification and division. Meanwhile, however, if the student wishes to anticipate in what directions Dr. Bremer is most likely to differ from his co-laborers or predecessors, he must be referred to the preface of the present volume, as well as to its table of contents, which is based on Dr. Bremer's divisions and groups and for which he, therefore, assumes the responsibility.

In conclusion we may remark that this table might have been improved in clearness if so many Roman numerals of nearly the same type had not been used for the different subdivisions.

The following are a few unimportant errors and omissions: H. Holthausen, in the index of authors, should be F. Holthausen, the author of 1486 and 1487 being identical with the one of 1241; the name of the author of 1237, 'Die Krefelder Mundart, etc.,' H. Röttches, is omitted in the index.

C. H. BIERWIRTH.

Harvard University.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Extraits des Chroniqueurs français du moyen-âge, Villehardouin, Joinville, Froissart, Commines; avec notices biographiques et notes grammaticales par S. PETIT DE JULLEVILLE, Paris: A. Colin & Cie. 1893. 8vo, pp. 408.

THIS compilation, appearing so shortly after the 'Extraits des Chroniqueurs français' of Gaston Paris and A. Jeanroy (Paris, 1892), contains essentially the same subject matter, though in somewhat fuller measure. Each extract forms a chapter by itself in Petit de Julleville, whereas brief historical summaries connect the different passages in Paris-Jeanroy. The editors in both instances follow Natalis de Wailly in his texts of Villehardouin (1872) and Joinville (1881). The Paris-Jeanroy edition alone, however, is normalized. In the case of Froissart, Paris-Jeanroy follow Luce (1869-1888) as far as completed, and for the remainder, Kervyn de Lettenhove (1870-1877): Petit de Julleville adopts the latter text throughout. Again, with Commines, Paris-Jeanroy quote Chantelauze (1881) and borrow besides from Mlle. Dupont's edition for the *Société d'His-*

toire de France (Paris, 1840-1847): Petit de Julleville stands altogether by the older version.

Petit de Julleville presupposes on the part of the student a knowledge of the elements of Old French grammar. The notes appended to the texts cover some thirty-five pages, and are mainly glosses of obscure or obsolete expressions. No attempt is made to emphasize the grammatical side; the title of the book is, therefore, somewhat misleading in this respect. The work is not technical in character; it lacks in philological treatment, even of an elementary kind. It contains neither historical glossary nor geographical map, such as are found in the Paris-Jeanroy edition. The reader, however, need not go outside the book itself for assistance in difficulties of translation, as he sometimes has to do for the Paris-Jeanroy text. Good historical notes are given at the bottom of the page, and the biographical notices are uniformly excellent.

BENJAMIN DURVEA WOODWARD.

Columbia College.

CORRESPONDENCE.

DOCTRINE OF BILINGUALISM.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—I venture to address a few lines to you in deprecation of the adverse sentence which Mr. O. F. Emerson in your pages has passed upon what he calls my "Doctrine of Bilingualism;" and I hope I may be able to advance something which may incline him to reconsider his verdict.

Mr. Emerson begins with a series of quotations from authors who have followed me in my error. The list is one that might give a man pause, and make him ask himself whether he had maturely considered his reasons and could marshal them in demonstrative array as arguments. For if authors such as he has quoted have taken the statement from me, it is even so an important testimony to its soundness;—if they have revived it by their own observation, then the value of their testimony is still higher.

A vague flight of reasons appears in the field against me, but two only are developed as if

they were relied upon, and indeed they are the only two that are tangible. They are these: (1) The bilingual couplings in Chaucer's *Prologue* are out-numbered by others which are not bilingual, being either wholly French or wholly English; (2) In the Alfredian translations and especially in that of Bede, there are numerous instances of couplings, one Latin word being rendered by two English words. These are the chief grounds for pronouncing me to be in error when I assert that a practice of coupling words bilingually rose out of the relations of the two races after the Norman Conquest, and that this practice grew into a habit which forms a characteristic of the English language.

Of these two reasons the second is quite foreign to the matter in hand, and, therefore, it will be convenient to dispatch it first. What we have to do with is the coupling of words which are destined to interpret one another. The couplings in Bede are of another kind, they are destined to interpret a Latin word. They are of the same nature as the duplicate or triplicate renderings attached to many a Latin word in the Glossaries. They belong to the studious process of exegesis or the academical interpretation of an ancient text; whereas the matter now before us relates to external conditions, and belongs to the unstudied spontaneous operation of those conditions in stocking colloquial speech with an assortment of equivalents. This is, I think, enough to remove the duplicates in Bede from the area of the present question. Let me now pause here a moment, and append a corollary to this, before I proceed to Mr. Emerson's other argument.

In discussions of this kind it is well to keep the operations of natural causes distinctly apart from the operations of study; and if Mr. Emerson had observed this distinction, he would surely have foregone one at least of his many subsidiary reasonings. He would not have thought it worth his while to urge that this pairing of bilingual equivalents could not have happened at that time, because it would be a difficult task even for the scholar of the present day. Many things that are hard in studious effort, are easy in nature. It would be hard for a man to change the tone and